

### Remarks

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Stark et al. (US 5,967,636). Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Doany (US 5,921,650). Claims 2-3, 16-19, and 21 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

10

#### 1. Docket number change

The applicant noticed an error in the attorney docket number recorded for this application. The applicant politely requests the attorney docket number be changed from "ADI-039" to --API-039--.

15

#### 2. Erroneous canceling of claims 14-19:

Claims 14-19 were inadvertently and erroneously canceled in the submitted specification. Although these claims have been acted upon in the current Office action, it is requested of applicant that a copy of these claims be submitted with any amendment in order to have a clean (not crossed out) copy of these claims.

20

25

#### **Response:**

A clean copy of original claims 2-21 has been provided with this response to the Office action. Furthermore, claims 1 and 22 have been amended, as shown above.

30

#### 3. Figure 1 designated as Prior Art.

Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated.

**Response:**

Fig.1 has been corrected to contain a legend stating "Prior Art". An amended Fig.1 is provided  
5 along with a marked copy of the original Fig.1 showing the changes made in red ink.

4. Rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second  
10 paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 22 is indefinite because it is not clear what angle  
15 is being claimed. It appears from Fig.2 that the claimed angle between a normal of the image module (50) and the optical axis of the second lens set (46) is an orthogonal one. Please particularly point out where this claimed angle is illustrated and defined.

20 **Response:**

Claim 22 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 22 now states "wherein the angle  
25 formed by the optical axis of the second lens set and a plane containing the image module is between 0 to 15 degrees". Support for this limitation is shown in Fig.3 and is stated on page 6, lines 3-7. No new matter has been added through this change. Reconsideration of claim 22 is hereby requested.

30 5. Rejection of claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Stark et al. (US 5,967,636) for reasons of record, as recited on page 3 of

the above-indicated Office action (part of paper no.4).

**Response:**

5 The applicant wishes to point out the limitation  
of claim 1 which distinguishes the present invention  
from Stark et al. (hereinafter referred to as Stark).

10 Claim 1 contains the limitation "the optical path  
of the incident light beam reflected from the image  
module intersects a plane formed by the optical paths  
of the incident light beam from the light source  
to the reflective mirror and from the reflective  
15 mirror to the image module at only one point", which  
is illustrated in Fig.3.

15 In Fig.3, the light beam 46 traveling from the  
light source 21 to the reflective mirror 30 and the  
light beam 48 traveling from the reflective mirror  
30 to the image module 34 form a plane. The light  
20 beam 50 reflects from the image module 34 to the  
projecting module 36. If extended lines are drawn  
on either side of the light beam 50, it is shown  
that **the light beam 50 intersects the plane formed  
by light beam 46 and light beam 48 at only one point.**

25 On the other hand, in Fig.2 **Stark does not teach  
or suggest that light** reflected from the image module  
50 to the projecting module 52 **intersects the plane**  
formed by light traveling from the light source 32  
30 to the reflective mirror 46 and light traveling from  
the reflective mirror 46 to the image module 50 **at  
only one point.** In fact, it appears as if the light  
beam lies within the plane, meaning the light beam  
intersects the plane at an infinite number of points.

35

Therefore, Stark does not anticipate the present

invention according to the currently amended claim 1. Claims 4-7, 9-15, and 20 all depend on claim 1 and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, and 20 is hereby requested.

6. Rejection of claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Doany (US 5,921,650) for reasons of record, as recited on page 3 of the above-indicated Office action (part of paper no.4).

**Response:**

As with Stark above, claim 1 is distinguished from Doany in that the light beam 50 intersects the plane formed by light beam 46 and light beam 48 at only one point.

On the other hand, in Fig.13 **Doany does not teach or suggest that light** reflected from the image module 350 to the projecting module 375 **intersects the plane** formed by light traveling from the light source 305 to the reflective mirror 205 and light traveling from the reflective mirror 205 to the image module 350 **at only one point**. In fact, it appears as if the light beam lies within the plane, meaning the light beam intersects the plane at an infinite number of points.

Therefore, Doany does not anticipate the present invention according to the currently amended claim 1. Claim 8 depends on claim 1 and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1 and 8 is hereby requested.

7. Objection to claims 2-3, 16-19, and 21:

Claims 2-3, 16-19, and 21 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5

**Response:**

Claims 2-3, 16-19, and 21 all depend on claim 1 and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2-3, 16-19, and 21 is hereby requested.

10

Respectfully submitted,

15

Winston Hsu Date: 6/23/2003

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No.41,526

P.O. BOX 506

20 Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw